



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,300	01/22/2002	Srinivas Mandyam	2102299-991130	2017
29906	7590	01/25/2006	EXAMINER	
INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C. 7150 E. CAMELBACK, STE. 325 SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251			NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/056,300

Applicant(s)

MANDYAM ET AL.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-18 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-18 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 11/09/2005 to the original application filed 01/22/2002.
2. Claims 1-10 and 13-18 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Claims 11-12 have been canceled. Claims 1 and 10 are independent claims.

***Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

*(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language; or "* (Emphasis added.)

4. Claims 1-4 and 6-9 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Chau et al.** (US 6,721,727, filed 11/2000).

**As to claim 1**

Chau teaches (*see the Abstract*) a computer-based (*e.g., a computer*) method for extracting content from a document (*e.g., XML documents*), comprising the step of:

- (a) creating set of selection envelopes (*e.g., create SQL queries; col.10, lines 48-49*), wherein each selection envelop is associated with at least one selection command for locating a particular portion of the content within the document (*e.g., XML element contents or attributes values extracted from XML document ... data type of an element or attribute can be specified, searches can be performed on SQL general data type and range searches can be performed; col.24, lines 49-58*), wherein each selection command is a function configure to locate (*e.g., the use of SELECT command*) the particular portion of the content to be enclosed by a corresponding selection envelope, wherein each successive selection command narrows (*e.g., the use of WHERE command*) the content to be enclosed by the selection envelope corresponding to the selection command (*see the SQL discussion beginning at col.23, line 35; col.25, line 5 & col. 43, line 4*);
- (b) applying each selection command and its corresponding selection envelope to the content until the specific content from the document is enclosed (*e.g., Sriram Srinivasan*) in a particular one (*e.g., sales\_tab*) of the selection envelopes (*see the SQL discussion beginning at col.23, line 35; col.25, line 5 & col. 43, line 4*).

**As to claim 2**

Chau teaches (*col.26, lines 5-9*) begin marker (*sales-tab*) and an end marker (*>2500.00*), which respectively define the beginning and end of the selection envelope.

**As to claim 3**

Chau teaches (*col.43, lines 42-45*) a parent envelope (*e.g., SELECT clause*) and a child envelope (*e.g., WHERE clause*).

**As to claim 4**

Chau teaches the child envelope is nested within the parent envelope (*e.g., SELECT ... SELECTING DISTINCT; col.26, lines 51-54*).

**As to claim 6**

Chau teaches the child envelope is completely outside of the parent envelope (*col.38, lines 15-40*).

**As to claim 7**

Chau teaches a command based on the document structure (*e.g., XML query parameter; col. 40, lines 48-65*).

**As to claim 8**

Chau teaches a command based on a character pattern (*e.g., SQL query; col.38, lines 50-67*).

**As to claim 9**

Chau teaches (*col.38, lines 40-47*) a combined command (*e.g., define mapping ... XML document using SQL mapping*) based on both document structure (*e.g., XML*) and a character pattern (*e.g., SQL*).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would*

Art Unit: 2176

*have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

*This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).*

6. Claims 10 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over  
**Chau et al.**

**As to claim 10**

- a. The rejection of independent claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full.
- b. Chau does not explicitly teach “*determining whether the first content is the desired content; extracting the first content if the first content is the desired content; defining a child selection envelope corresponding to the second command for locating second content within the content source if the first content is not said desired content; using the second selection command associated with the child selection command to select the second content from the content resource; determining whether the second content is the desired content; and extracting the second content if the second content is the desired content.*”
- c. However, Chau suggests (*e.g., Suppose there are more than 1000 XML documents stored...the WHERE clause did the filtering on the collection of 1000 XML documents; col.24, lines 20-47*).
- d. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to applied Chau’s suggestion to implement the features as

claimed Chau because it would have provided the capability for locating a desired content stored in a table created in a relational database management system.

**As to claim 13**

Chau teaches a document (*e.g., XML document; col.6, line 10*).

**As to claim 14**

Chau teaches a section of a document (*e.g., the XML documents... multiple pieces; col.7, lines 5-7*).

**As to claim 15**

Chau teaches determining whether the source is structure (*e.g., XML document ... a tree structure; col.44, lines 20-21*) or unstructured, and selecting the at least one selection command is based upon this determination (*e.g., SQL query; col.44, lines 37-38*).

**As to claim 16**

Chau teaches structure based command selected from, among other things, select by attribute commands (*e.g., SQL query and maps the data obtained from the SQL query into elements and attributes; col.35, lines 51-53*).

**As to claim 17**

Chau teaches a character based command selected from, among other things, select text matching pattern commands (*col.38, line 40-col.39, line 45*).

**As to claim 18**

It includes the same limitations as in claim 9, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

7. Claims 5 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Chau et al.** in view of **Coppperman et al.** (U.S. 6,711,585 – filed 06/2000).

**As to claim 5**

- a. Chau does not explicitly teach “*the child envelope partially overlaps the parent envelope.*”
- b. Coppperman teaches the child envelope partially overlaps the parent envelope (*col.23, lines 54-67*).
- c. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature from Coppperman in the system of Chau because it would have provided the capability for eliminating the concept-node from the input set and to re-initiate the knowledge map generation mechanism.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant’s arguments filed 11/09/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that *Chau does not teach creating set of selection envelopes, wherein each selection envelop is associated with at least one selection command for locating a particular portion of the content within the document, wherein each selection command is a function configure to locate the particular portion of the content to be enclosed by a*



*corresponding selection envelope, wherein each successive selection command narrows the content to be enclosed by the selection envelope corresponding to the selection command; and applying each selection command and its corresponding selection envelope to the content until the specific content from the document is enclosed in a particular one of the selection envelopes (Remarks, page 7).*

In response, Chau teaches creating set of selection envelopes (*e.g., create SQL queries; col.10, lines 48-49*), wherein each selection envelop is associated with at least one selection command for locating a particular portion of the content within the document (*e.g., XML element contents or attributes values extracted from XML document ... data type of an element or attribute can be specified, searches can be performed on SQL general data type and range searches can be performed; col.24, lines 49-58*), wherein each selection command is a function configure to locate (*e.g., the use of SELECT command*) the particular portion of the content to be enclosed by a corresponding selection envelope, wherein each successive selection command narrows (*e.g., the use of WHERE command*) the content to be enclosed by the selection envelope corresponding to the selection command (*see the SQL discussion beginning at col.23, line 35; col.25, line 5 & col. 43, line 4*); and applying each selection command and its corresponding selection envelope to the content until the specific content from the document is enclosed (*e.g., Sriram Srinivasan*) in a particular one (*e.g., sales\_tab*) of the selection envelopes (*see the SQL discussion beginning at col.23, line 35; col.25, line 5 & col. 43, line 4*).

*Applicant argued that Chau does not teach defining a child selection envelope corresponding to the second command for locating second content within the content source if the first content is not said desired content; using the second selection command associated with the child selection command to select the second content from the content resource; determining whether the second content is the desired content; and extracting the second content if the second content is the desired content (Remarks, page 11).*

In response, Applicant simply points out what is broadly recited in claim 10 and asserts that “Chau reference fails to teach...as required by claim 10”. This quote is the extent of explanation provided by Applicant in support of claim 10. This response by Applicant is insufficient to satisfy the requirement of specific argument to have the claims considered for patentability; in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Applicant must distinctly and specifically point out “how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references”. However, the rejection above clarifies how Chau meet the claim limitations as amended by Applicant.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gupta et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,826,258	issued: Oct. 20, 1998
Madnick et al.	U.S. Patent No. 5,913,214	issued: Jun. 15, 1999
Van Eaton et al.	U.S. Patent No. 6,948,117	issued: Sep. 20, 2005

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

***Contact information***

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN

*William L. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
*1/20/2006*